



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REPORTS.

HERMES, 1885.<sup>1</sup>

No. I.

W. Dittenberger. The Kerykes of Eleusis. This treatise on an interesting topic of Attic antiquities is by one of the editors of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum*, which collection, to a very great extent, furnishes the material for the author's statements and arguments. Of the former we may note that there was but *one* γένος of κήρυκες in Attica. Here, as elsewhere, paternal descent determined membership, and a boy once introduced by his father could not afterwards be received into any other γένος. There was an ἄρχων τοῦ γένους with one year's term of office; there were, moreover, a treasurer (ταμίης) and a priest for the special worship of the γένος. Eleusis seems to have been the place of meeting.

This γένος regularly furnished three of the religious functionaries who took part in the ceremonies of the Eleusinian mysteries: the torchbearer (δαδούχος), the herald (κήρυξ), and the "priest at the altar" (ὁ ἐπὶ βωμῷ), whereas the "hierophants" belonged to the γένος of the Eumolpidae. The office of daduchos was for a long time held by the Calliadae of Athens, and when this family became extinct the privilege was certainly maintained within the limits of the same γένος. This office of the torchbearer, with that of the priest and of the herald, was held for life. While the Archon Basileus of Athens was the chief executive functionary in the celebration of the Eleusinian mysteries, the γένος of the κήρυκες had certain official functions in arranging the celebration. Each and every member of the γένος enjoyed the right of initiating (μυεῖν) new members into the mysteries—a privilege shared by the Eumolpidae alone.

In the Roman era the political importance of these offices was greatly increased: the κήρυξ τῆς ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλῆς (pp. 35-6), as well as the κήρυξ βουλῆς καὶ δήμου, were exclusively appointed from the γένος of the Kerykes. Herodes Atticus was a member of the same.

L. von Sybel. Toxaris. After presenting the views of Lobeck, Welcker, Preller, Hirschfeld (Hermes, 1874), and Paucker, Sybel insists that Toxaris, the "foreign physician" (Dem. XIX 249), and Alkon are three separate persons. Moreover, Sybel holds that Toxaris, the beneficent Scythian, is an invention of Lucian, for the legend of his saving advice how to check the plague at Athens in 430 B. C. is inconsistent with Thucydides. The name of Δειμανέτης, to whom Toxaris is said by Lucian to have appeared on that occasion, has an ironical flavor when reduced to its etymology. As regards the στήλη on the outskirts of Athens, which, according to Lucian, exhibited a Scythian holding a bow in

<sup>1</sup> The reporter desires to express his special obligations to the chief librarian and assistant librarians of Columbia College, New York City, for placing the valuable resources of the library at his disposal.—E. G. S.

one hand and a "roll of MS" in the other, Sybel calls attention to a pair of archers found on the same ground and now preserved in the Museum of Athens, and Sybel's suggestion that Lucian used one of these figures to construct his Toxaris legend upon is certainly very plausible.

H. Nohl. On the Value and Descent of Certain MSS of Cicero's Verrinae IV and V preserved at Wolfenbüttel. Nohl holds that they are copies from the text of a Paris MS.

Wilamowitz. Ein altattisches Epigramm. As such W. interprets the poem Anthol. Palat. XIII 28. On its face it is an epinikion of a chorus of the tribe 'Ακαμαντίς at Athens, and it seems to have been inscribed upon the tripod which became the ἀνάθημα of the victors. The arguments of Wilamowitz are, of course, mainly based upon internal evidence. The general resemblance which the poem bears to the Pindaric type of composition is striking. W. holds the poem to be a dithyramb of the age of the Persian wars, say between 490 and 480.

The metre, indeed, is anomalous. As a work of art the poem is too inferior to be assigned to either Simonides or Bacchylides; but while of small intrinsic value, these verses would seem to be of considerable historical interest.

G. Faltin. Hannibal's Invasion of Etruria (217 B. C.). The author discusses the historical tradition in detail, weighing the evidence of Polybius and of Livy, as well as of modern students such as Niebuhr, Nissen (Italische Landeskunde), Neumann and others. The swamps which Hannibal traversed early in 217 B. C. were on the Etruscan side of the Apennine. A detailed report on this paper would be feasible only if a detailed map of the Apennine could be here affixed.

O. Richter, a special student of the topography of Rome, discusses the term *insula*, quoting, amongst other passages, the following from Festus, p. III: *Insulae proprie dicuntur quae non iunguntur parietibus cum vicinis circuituque publico aut privato cinguntur, i. e.* houses detached from all others by an *ambitus*, which the Twelve Tables fixed at  $2\frac{1}{2}$  *pedes*. Later, when single houses ceased to be thus detached, the word *insula* was used for something analogous to an American 'block,' as well as for large tenements. In the age of Constantine Rome contained, within the walls of Aurelian, 1681 *domus* and 44,300 *insulae*. How is *insula* to be taken for this era? The trouble is that no census of the full number of inhabitants of Rome has been handed down. So much, however, may be gathered from special data (*e. g.* that at the time of Severus some 200,000 persons were entitled to receive *frumentum publicum*) that it would not do to take *insula* simply as 'house.' Richter holds that *insula* was the unit of taxed property in improved real estate, in very many cases a 'story' of large tenement buildings, in other cases an entire large apartment-house, *domus* corresponding to 'mansion.' To some extent this paper, like other papers on kindred subjects by the same author, controverts the positions taken by Jordan.

M. Mayer (Berlin). On the (last) Protesilaos of Euripides, a Reconstruction. Protesilaos was the first of the Greeks who fell in the Trojan expedition immediately upon landing, having been married but one day when the fleet

set sail from Aulis. Upon imploring the powers of the lower world, he received permission to return (although but for a very brief time) to his young wife. There is some reference to the legend in Eustathius on Il. II 325, where two statements are given. Further on Mayer quotes Tzetzes, who relates in detail that the widow fashioned a wooden image of Protesilaos :

ξύλινον εἰδωλον ποιεῖ μορφῆς Πρωτεσίλαον  
καὶ συνεκοίταζεν αὐτῇ τῷ πόθῳ τοῦ συζύγου· κτέ.

Tzetzes also relates that, according to the most correct version, she took her own life with the sword. An image of Protesilaos probably figured in the play. Ovid, *Heroid.* XIII 150 sqq., makes it wax; the *ἄψυχος φίλος* of *Fragm.* 657 evidently is to be understood as referring to the image. Lucian, *Dial. Mort.* 23, deals with the same subject. Hyginus' collection presents two versions, according to the latter of which Laodamia (the faithful spouse) flung herself upon the pyre on which the waxen image was being consumed at the behest of her father, Acastos. A conflict probably was worked out in the drama as between the young widow and her father: she refusing to surrender the waxen image, and he insisting that she must do so and, moreover, wed a second husband. Then the appearance of Protesilaos from the lower world, the meeting with Laodamia and with Acastos, were no doubt treated by Euripides with telling effect. A sarcophagus in Naples and one in the Vatican exhibit scenes from the legend. The paper is of substantial value.

Th. Mommsen. Zama. Owing to the French invasion of Tunisia, Roman inscriptions in great abundance have been gathered, being found between 1881 and 1884. Amongst other results, this too is notable—that the location of the two Zamas is now ascertained. They were about 30 Roman miles apart, being situated on the northern slopes of that mountain range which is cut in two by the Siliannah River in its upper course, one being about 60, and the westerly about 100 *milia passuum* from Hadrumetum (Sousah), to which port Hannibal fled after the disastrous end of the famous battle 202 B. C. Mommsen argues that the westerly Zama was the scene of the battle.

A. Kirchhoff publishes a very ancient inscription of Thessaly (not much later, according to the character of the letters, than 500 B. C.), which he edits as follows: *Μνᾶμ' ἐμὶ Πυρ(ρ)ιά | δα, δς οὐκ ἦπ(ι) | στατο φεύγειν (φεύγειν on the ins.) ἀλλ(λ)' αἰθε περ γᾶς | τᾶσδε πολ(λ)ὸν ἂ | ριστεύων ἔθανε*—an evident attempt to construct an elegiac distich, in which the pentameter, however, goes to pieces. *αἰθε* is a problem.

## No. II.

A. Kopp (on the *Homeric Lexicon* of Apion) discusses the sources of certain glosses contained in the *Homer MSS* Baroccianus of Oxford, and a Darmstadt MS. The principle of Apion's lexicon (discernible even now, in spite of the late shape in which the remnants appear, and the woful condition of the present collection) seems to have been to give every sense of those words which have more than one meaning. Exceptions are probably due to later compilers. Many articles in the *Homeric lexicon* of Apollonius Sophista are due to Apion, in defense of which view Kopp argues against Lehrs.

H. Kühlewein. *Critical Notes on the Text of Hippocrates' Treatise on Wounds in the Head*, often criticising Littré's edition.

R. Thommen. On the Time at which Polybius composed his History (pp. 196-236). Th. calls attention to the fact that Polybius, at the outset, marked the downfall of the Macedonian dynasty, 168 B. C., as the limit of his work; later, however, he undertook the adding of subsequent events down to 145 B. C.—events of which he was not only a spectator, but in which he to a certain extent shared as an actor (III 4, 13). Books I-II were composed as one work. These books were composed while Polybius was still, officially, a prisoner of state, although at liberty to move about freely in Italy, visiting Locri, *e. g.* before 156 B. C., likewise the Po-country, etc.

Next, as to Books III-VI. In VI, capp. 52, 56, etc., Polybius, in comparing the character and practice of Rome and Carthage, uses the present tense in a way that would be inconsistent with the destruction of Carthage; evidently these books were written before 146. Both in VI 1, 1-3 and in III 1, 8 he maintains the period of 53 years as the compass of his task.

Passages which suggest later composition, Thommen (pp. 210 sqq.) explains as later additions by Polybius. In the company of Scipio Aemilianus, Polybius made a journey across the Alps to Spain, and into Africa, where he met and conversed with old Massinissa.<sup>1</sup> Books VII-VIII afford no clues for chronological determination. In IX 9, 9 Polybius still speaks of Carthage as a political power in the present tense. XII 25, 3 implies the actual existence of Carthage; other *indicia* point to the conclusion that this book was written between 155-152. XIV 10, 5 is interpreted in a similar manner. The chronological explanation of the reference to the splendor of Jerusalem, XVI 39, 4-5, Thommen leaves an open question. But, to sum up, Th. argues that Books I-XXX contained the carrying out of his great original project, viz. to bring his work down to 168 B. C.

After an interval of 15 years or so he added the rest. The episode on his personal relations to Scipio Aemilianus in XXXII was probably written before <sup>2</sup> the death of Scipio, 129 B. C., and after 132. Many portions of this, as well as of other portions of these later books, were jotted down immediately after the events, and were bodily edited in the old age of the author. On the whole, chronological clues in the second portion of the work are rarer.

Jul. Beloch (On the National Wealth of Attica) attempts to overthrow the accepted views on population, grain-production, wealth, as laid down by Boeckh in the Staatshaushaltung; the grain-production, which Boeckh put at 2,800,000 medimni, Beloch reduces to 700,000. Much of the argument of Beloch turns on the subject of *εἰσφορά*, which for the era of Demosthenes Boeckh takes as meaning not only the property-tax itself, but also the *rate* of assessment. This interpretation Beloch rejects, but goes still further, viz. he discredits the data presented by Demosthenes, contra Aphobum I, as to the patrimony of Demosthenes, claiming, *e. g.* that the slaves who were cutlers were not worth five to six minae (cf. Aphob. 9) each, but only two minae. Demosthenes, he claims, exaggerated his fortune threefold or more, and all computations based thereon must fall to the ground according to Beloch.

<sup>1</sup> Thommen's attempt to prove that Polybius made other tours across the Alps before this one seems to rest on very slender foundations indeed.—E. G. S.

<sup>2</sup> But how is XXXII 9, 1 to be explained: *θάρττον ἢ καθῆκεν ἐξέλαμψεν ἢ τοῦ Σκιπίωνος ἐν τῇ Πρώμῃ δόξα*?—E. G. S.

While the arguments of Beloch impress the reader in the main as defective,<sup>1</sup> it will be well if his speculations stir up classical students to renewed study of the data and topics involved.

W. Soltau. On the Manipular System of Roman Tactics. H. Delbrück (Hist. Zeitschrift, Neue Folge, XV 239) had seriously questioned whether the accepted view of the arrangement of the *manipuli*, and subsequently of the cohorts, in battle—the famous system of intervals producing the *quincunx*—was really correct, but he seems to have overlooked the manoeuvre of *laxare ordines*, by which, in the moment of going into action, the actual front was easily doubled; which point, too, is referred to by Polybius in his description of the battle of Kynoskephalai, 197 B. C., in which the Roman *manipuli* were confronted with the Macedonian phalanx. Polybius says that while standing in battle array, the Romans, just like the phalanx of Macedon, occupied three feet per man, but double the space in action: *προφανές, ὅτι χάλασμα καὶ διάσταςιν ἀλλήλων ἔχειν δεήσει τοὺς ἀνδρας ἐλάχιστον τρεῖς πόδας κατ' ἐπιστάτην καὶ κατὰ παραστάτην, εἰ μέλλουσιν εὐχρηστεῖν πρὸς τὸ δέον*. Ἐκ δὲ τούτου συμβήσεται τὸν ἐνα 'Ρωμαῖον ἵστασθαι κατὰ δύο πρωτοστάτας τῶν φαλαγγιτῶν, κτέ.

Th. Mommsen. Oropos and the Roman Tax-Farmers. In 86 B. C. Sulla defeated the generals of Mithridates at Chaeronea. About this time he made a vow to Amphiaraios giving immunity from Roman taxation to the citizens of Oropos, and decreeing that all revenues and imposts of that port should be set aside for the sanctuary of Amphiaraios there. Now, the *publicani*, in course of time, insisted on collecting taxes from Oropos, and pointed to the clause in their contract with the State which exempted lands and other property consecrated to the "immortal gods," claiming that Amphiaraios was nothing of the kind. Three delegates from Oropos, together with representatives of the *publicani*, in 73 B. C., appeared before a sub-committee of 15 senators, of whom M. Tullius Cicero was one, arguing the case. This committee decided against the *publicani*, and upheld the decree of Sulla and the resultant claim of the Oropians. All of this is set forth in an inscription found on a marble slab near the ancient site of the sanctuary of Amphiaraios near Oropus, found by the Archaeological Society of Athens, in course of recent excavations, and first published in the *Ἐφημερίς ἀρχαιολογική*, 1884, p. 98 sqq. The Greek text is palpably a slavish translation of the Latin document received from Rome.

Th. Kock. Emendationes Aeschyleae.

E. G. SIHLER.

INTERNATIONALE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ALLGEMEINE SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT, von F. TECHMER. II Band, 1 Hälfte. Leipzig, 1885.

The new journal, now in its second year, goes on to justify its name by being fairly international. The Germans, indeed, predominate; but alongside of articles from Leipzig and Halle, come others from London and St. Petersburg

<sup>1</sup>One of the chief arguments of Beloch's paper turns on the correct interpretation of c. Aphob. 7: "τὸ δὲ πλῆθος τῆς οὐσίας ὅτι τοῦτ' ἦν τὸ καταλειφθέν κτέ," where ὅσον must be taken as referring to the *rate* of taxes paid (20 per cent.) on the assessment, and where, most assuredly, the context implies that the lower assessments involved a *lower rate*. Boeckh's view of εἰσφορά for the present should be maintained.—E. G. S.

and Washington; and two of the essays are in English. In all the points that make the attractive book, Techmer's *Zeitschrift* is beautiful to see, pleasant to handle, and easy to read. In contents also, especially to students of anthropology and of language on its psychological and scientific sides, the journal offers many attractions. And even for students of narrower range, for specialists in Latin, Greek, English, etc., there is a good amount of new knowledge and of useful facts and theories. It is, indeed, the manifest aim of Dr. Techmer to bring the most modern achievements of linguistic science into relation with the practical processes of teaching. In his philology there is a strong bent toward pedagogy.

In the new number, the article that has the deepest and most permanent interest is one of 20 pages, by Dr. F. Kluge, of Jena, on the History of Sign-Language. In this he edits with admirable precision an Anglo-Saxon treatise, never published before, on the Sign-Language of the Anglo-Saxon Monasteries. The text, with translation and notes, fills 13 pages. In respect both of the language itself, which is very careful and precise in grammatical forms, and very rich in vocabulary, and also of the customs and manners revealed, this treatise is of lively interest and great value.

Next to this in value comes a long essay, of 71 pages, by Dr. A. F. Pott, of Halle, the beginning of a great work to be called an Introduction to the General Science of Language. This beginning is devoted to the literature and bibliography of the less familiar departments of the science. It brings together into one body of classified authorities, carefully criticised, the chief works, down to the most modern, that bear on the languages of Asia. Under each head the author gives an interesting, and sometimes elaborate, discussion of the linguistic position and relation of the language or dialect in question. The essay represents the outcome of an enormous learning. Of especial interest are his remarks on the language of Japan, pp. 74 *seq.*, of the Caucasus, pp. 99 *seq.*, and of the Gypsies, pp. 111 *seq.* Under this last head, Dr. Pott, going back to his own brilliant study of the Gypsy language, published 1844-5, gathers together the facts accumulated during forty years to give support to the theory of Gypsy origin that may now be accepted as final.

In addition to these two great articles, there are five others that from one or other aspect of philology are worth study. Dr. G. Ebers gives, in 31 pages, a bright and learned sketch of Richard Lepsius as student of languages. Prof. Herbert Baynes, writing in English, gives, in 12 pages, a suggestive essay "On the Psychological Side of Language." Dr. Karl Abel, in an essay that promises much for the future, opens up, in 12 pages, some novel views on "The Question of the Relationship of Languages." Dr. W. Radloff, of St. Petersburg, in a paper of 29 pages, continues his account of the language of the Komanes. This, although very clearly arranged and full of curious facts, can have interest for very few students. But the essay by the editor, Dr. Techmer, "On the Development, Formation and Acquisition of Language," will interest all that are either students or teachers. For those especially that have to teach the mother tongue or any one of the great modern languages, the clear reasoning, excellent method and definite results of this essay are very valuable.

First, in respect of the philosophy of language, the essay of Baynes is

founded upon the study of the ways in which reason and speech, as interdependent powers, act and react upon each other. There is, he says, p. 3 *seq.*, in the development of the human being a fourfold succession of phenomena: 1st, feeling; 2d, sensation; 3d, perception; 4th, apperception. Of these, feeling and sensation result respectively in cries and interjections. Perception now comes into play, and out of these cries and interjections produces, by means of onomatopoeia, a new class of sounds, which deserve to be called words. Finally, apperception, which is the grouping of perceptions into concepts, gives the possibility of connected discourse "in an endless progress of linguistic structure and variety." The reasoning is subtle, but it is clearly stated and well exemplified. The theory itself, if accepted, has the merit of making atonement between two sharply conflicting theories. Strangely enough, Dr. Techmer, in his essay, p. 145 *seq.*, approaches the same problem, trying another line of solution. But, although he starts from a different point, he too works out a fourfold succession in the development of speech: 1st, the period of natural cries and significant gestures; 2d, the period of pointing (demonstrative roots); 3d, the period of imitation (onomatopoeia); 4th, the period of metaphor, symbolism and abstraction. The two schemes have, it is plain, much in common, and they explain much. In each the 4th stage has the highest interest. Here, too, in explaining the formation of concepts, Baynes comes to a threefold statement of the process. Where Techmer has metaphor, symbolism and abstraction, Baynes has synonymy, homonymy and antonymy. This does not seem so adequate as Techmer's division; but it serves to introduce a beautiful discussion of some difficult and neglected parts of philology. The power of antonymy—*e. g.*, *bad* and *better* in English—to form words and develop roots, has never, we think, been enough regarded. In connection with this subject, the quotations made by Techmer from Wundt's *Logic*, p. 147 *seq.*, show how firmly that great master of modern psychology has grasped the problem of human speech. Dr. Pott, on p. 92, brings forward a marvellous fact to unsettle accepted notions on the rapid growth and divergence of dialects. After so many centuries of separation, the Turks from Constantinople and the Siberian Turks from Tomsk and Jenisseisk are still able, by speaking slowly, to understand each other. On p. 55 of the same essay Dr. Pott gives a document of great scientific value in the classification of languages. It is the list prepared by Wiedemann of the languages spoken (1831) in the Russian Empire—a list arranged both according to morphological types and according to ethnographical groups. In respect of the study of barbaric languages and dialects—a study that now absorbs so much of the most adventurous intellect of philology—Dr. Ebers gives a picture of Lepsius' method which may serve both as warning and as encouragement. Lepsius checked and controlled his vast historical study of language in general and by family by means of the most minute study of language in particular. "In his great Introduction he boldly sketched the outline of a vast linguistic history that had run on for four or five thousand years, and embraced all the countries of Africa and the adjacent coast-lands of Asia; but in his Nubian Grammar he showed how to use the linguistic microscope and lay bare the nice phonetic shades of dialectic usage"; cf. pp. xix-xx. In the philosophy of language, however, it is the application, use or abuse, of the Darwinian theory of evolution that must most



excite the minds of contemporary thinkers. On this the views of Dr. Pott and the views of Dr. Abel, both presented with vigor and clearness, standing by accident opposed to each other in these pages, give to this volume of Techmer a singular interest. The older scholar attacks with vehement energy the theory that in the evolution of human speech there has been any steady development of the lower type into the higher (p. 66 *seq.*). There was, he maintains, no evolution of Indo-Germanic languages from Semitic or Turanian, no evolution of Semitic from Turanian. He sums up, on p. 103, with weighty words: "According to our present knowledge, we are fully justified in denying boldly the genealogical, nay more, the physiological unity of this trio of families, not to speak of others." Yet, with the generosity of boundless resources, even while he attacks and denies the evolution of language according to the scheme of the Darwinians, he gives, p. 79, to the attacked philosophy the knowledge and use of a new fact: "The people of Thibet derives, by tradition, its origin from a pair of apes—a piece of news that Darwinians ought not to let escape them. The race, however, speaks a human language." Against this statement of the absolute difference between Aryan and Semitic languages comes the essay of Dr. Abel. It is, in fact, a preparation of the public mind for the important book that he is now publishing.<sup>1</sup> He starts from a discussion of W. von Humboldt's famous *dictum* that resemblance in inflection is a better means of establishing kinship among languages than the common possession of significant roots. This is, indeed, true of languages that separated after the period of inflection had set in. But it cannot apply to languages that separated from each other before the parent language had developed its system of inflections. Here the resemblance of significant roots would be, it is plain, the only means of proving community of origin. This now is assumed by Abel to be the relation between Indo-European and Semitic languages. And, in his view, the old Egyptian, as now revealed, is "the bridge between the Indo-European and the Semitic groups." By a study of the established roots of the old Egyptian, we can, he thinks, trace those roots downward, independent of inflection, both into the Indo-European and into the Semitic tongues. In announcing his Dictionary of Roots, he promises to show that "at some remote period the formation of roots and stems went on by a common law in the three great branches of the Caucasian race, Egyptian, Aryan and Semitic." The essay is written with all the subtle charm and delightful suggestiveness of Dr. Abel's philological method. It raises the hope of seeing this great problem of science at last solved.

Secondly, in respect of the science of language-teaching, the long essay of Dr. Techmer, pp. 114-92, contains a great body of useful facts and thoughtful suggestions. In America, especially, where the reform and extension of modern-language teaching are now so warmly discussed, this essay should be studied by many. The question of the age at which the learning of the modern languages ought to begin comes in for elaborate discussion. Apart from exceptional cases, the editor thinks the age of eleven to be the right time for beginning, if (and the condition is all-important) the child have by this time a good mastery of words and constructions in his mother tongue. The method

<sup>1</sup> *Einleitung in ein ägyptisch-semitisch-indoeuropäisches Wurzelwörterbuch.* Leipzig, Friedrichs, 1886.

of instruction in the foreign language is then given with great detail and in admirable sequence. The editor's advice as to the use to make of practical phonetics in language-teaching is practical and wise. As to the scope of such teaching, he quotes the resolution adopted by the Convention of German Philologists and Schoolmasters at Dessau in 1885: "In French, as in English, in the elementary instruction, the reading of text ought to be the beginning and the aim, and the grammar ought to be taught only in subordination to that end by the inductive method" (p. 143). For the German child, the right beginning of foreign-language study is, Dr. Techmer urges, by all means the English. The arguments by which the claim of the English over the French is made good are ingenious and convincing. Finally, as to the teaching of the mother tongue itself, the editor exposes ably the radical blunder of Jacob Grimm, who, as is known, denied that the study of grammar should have any part in the study of the mother tongue by children. Against Grimm's fanciful conception of a method that should exclude grammar, he sets the able and profound words of Dr. von Raumer in favor of the right kind and amount of grammatical teaching. And even from Grimm himself he quotes later expressions of opinion that reduce his famous paradox almost to right reason.

In Latin, Dr. Pott shows examples—*e. g.*, *pad* and *duc*, p. 72—of roots that have the double function of noun and verb; and he points out the derivation of *pandere* and *passus* from *pad* (to go). He uses Latin examples also to illustrate the principle of phonetic symbolism; as compared with verbs that denote the passive state or condition, those verbs that denote the active bringing about of that condition—*i. e.*, causatives—are fitly characterized by a greater energy of consonants or by a heavier weight of vowels—*e. g.*, *sēdare*, *sōpio*.

In Greek, Dr. Pott brings back from his review of the Asiatic languages many definite etymologies of borrowed words. *Βαβυλών* has nothing to do with "confusion of tongues": it is the *Babilu* of the cuneiform inscriptions, "the gate of the god of the river," p. 57. *δάρυς*, used by the author of the *Periplus Maris Erythraei* to mean south, is the modern *Dekhan*: and the form of the word shows that by this time the Sanskrit form had passed into Prakrit. *Ταῶς* is the Tamil word *tōgei*. *σάνταλον* is the Sanskrit *chandana*, a tree from the Malabar region.

In English, finally, the essays contain a good number of interesting facts. *Japan* is the Chinese *zi-pen* (sun-rise), a parallel to *Levant* and *Natolia*. Pott, p. 75. *Chemistry* is from the Koptic *chame* (black), the art of the dark-skinned Egyptians, *ib.* p. 82. *Shaster*, the Gypsy word for Bible, is the Sanskrit *gastra*; and *devel*, the Gypsy word for God, is the Skt. *deva*, p. 114. *Ophir* is probably the Skt. *Suviva*, a land and nation in western India. *Tartar* is the Chinese *Tata*, and owes its r's to the punning of St. Louis with *Tartarus*, p. 84. *Turanian* and *Turan* are probably from the Afghan word *tūr* (black), p. 90. *Aryan*, traced back through its vast ramifications, seems to be the Skt. *aryá* (faithful). *Hindū* and *Hindoo*, as names of India, come from the Skt. *sindhu* (river), the native name of the *Indus*, p. 109. *Better*, through Gothic *batiza*, is traced back to a supposed Gothic verb *batan* (to be useful), cognate with Skt. *bhad-ra* (joyous), from root *bhand* (to shout), p. 104.

The syntactical relation between *than* and *then* is well developed by Pott on p. 68. The difference in nature and function between English and Chinese

monosyllables—a point on which much confusion exists—is clearly expounded on p. 59. Finally, on p. 75, Dr. Pott traces out the curious historical parallel between the Japanese and the English as “mixed languages.” The learned Chinese is there to the inherited Japanese as here the Latin to the Anglo-Saxon. The borrowed element is in both cases defined and controlled in grammar by the native.

THOS. R. PRICE.

ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXIKOGRAPHIE UND GRAMMATIK. Zweiter Jahrgang.

Heft 4.

This number opens with an article on *Per*, pp. 497–508, by Friedrich Stolz, which is intended to enlighten classical philologists, and to rid them of serious errors of conception in regard to the origin of this preposition. The oft-asserted identity of *per* with *παρά* must be given up. *παρά* represents an Indo-Germanic instrumental *prā*, while *per* represents a locative *peri* which before a vowel had lost its *i* and then become generalized. The accusative form of *per* is seen in *perendie* for *\*peremdie*. The real representative of the Greek *παρά* in Latin is *por-*, seen in *polliceo*, *portendo*, etc., while *prae* represents an Indo-Germanic dat. sing. *prāi*. The original signification of *per*, from which the other meanings have been developed, was that of “räumliche Durchdringung.” Compounds of *per* are then classified under the following heads: (1) where *per* = *rings um*, *rings umher*, *der Reihe nach*; (2) = *durch*, *hindurch*, *zer-*; (3) = *darüber hinaus*; (4) where it expresses “die Vollendung oder einen hohen Grad der betreffenden Handlung oder des Zustandes, ferner die lange Dauer der- oder desselben.” All the prepositional uses are easily derived from the first two of these meanings, but these uses are not considered in detail by Stolz. The postpositional *per*, seen in *topper*, *nuper*, *parumper*, etc., he compares with the Oscan *-pert*, following Mommsen.

Bücheler, p. 508, adduces new evidence from Photios, Lex. 592, for the obscene meaning attaching to *titus*, already discussed in Archiv II, p. 120, and shows that in the Sardinian *tidu*, *tidone*, *tudōne*, there are still traces of the word *titus* in the sense of *dove*.

Thielmann, pp. 509–549, brings to a conclusion his article on “*Habere* mit dem Part. Perf. Pass.” He emphasizes the point that the necessity of distinguishing between the logical or present perfect and the aorist perfect may have contributed to the use of *cognitum habeo* for the former. In recommending one person to another a regular formula is *commendatum habeto*. In Gaul *receptum* is substituted for *commendatum*. Other imperative forms are *dictum habeto*, *praeceptum habeto*, *promissum habeto*, *pactum habeto*. To confirm the close connection between the forms *mihi cognitum est* and *habeo cognitum*, he points to the fact that in most of the expressions where in Plautus the so-called Greek dative is used with a perfect participle, a parallel use with *habeo* is developed later, e. g. with *emptum*, *acceptum*, *spectatum*, *exquisitum*. In Cicero especially *habeo* is thus found combined with verbs which express an activity of the mind, particularly in the philosophical works. Thus we have Acad.

2, 2, *in animo res insculptas habebat*. Tusc. I, 57, *insitas et quasi consignatas habere in animis*. Cicero sometimes combines several synonyms, as De Fin. II 6, *habere bene cognitam voluptatem et satis firme conceptam animo atque comprehensam*. In this he is followed by Arnobius, who has the simple *cognitum habeo* but once. It is remarkable that *cognitum habeo*, so frequent in Cicero, does not occur in the letters of his correspondents, nor in Caesar, Sallust and Livy, who only use the passive form *est mihi cognitum*. Cicero usually has the order *habeo cognitum*, in which he is followed by Arnobius and Lactantius. In only two cases has he *cognitum habeo*, which, however, became the more usual order. The passive *aliquid cognitum habetur* does not occur until the sixth century. *Incognitum habeo* is first used by Suetonius, and its passive is found in Gallic Latin from the sixth century on. *Notum habui* is used by Valerius Maximus as a perfect to present *novi*, and this usage is noted by Diomedes and Charisius. *Ignotum habeo* is very rare. *Compertum habeo* was a great favorite with historical writers, occurring most frequently in Livy, but used also by orators. *Exploratum habeo* was used but for a short time. *Certum habeo*, used chiefly in the first person singular, and at first confined to the epistolary style, afterwards extended its use. *Persuasum habeo* is not used by Cicero, but found in Caesar and later writers. *Comprehensum habere* is philosophical and not at all colloquial, chiefly occurring in Cicero and his imitators. To sum up, historically, the occurrence of this usage in the comic poets proves it to be of the people. Terence is more limited in its use. It occurs in military expressions and in law Latin. Caesar uses *effectum habere*, the jurists *factum habere*. The usage is at its height in Caesar and Cicero; already, in the second century, it is found principally in the jurists. Few new examples are found in the African Latinity or elsewhere in writers of the third, fourth and fifth centuries. But in the sixth century the scene changes, and in Gregory of Tours we have a great many examples, affecting nearly every verb and not confined to fixed formulas. The early confusion of tenses in the Gallic Latin probably led to the revival and extension of the usage. In Italy and Spain the vulgar formation of the perfect with *habeo* followed somewhat later.

Karl Sittl (pp. 550-80): Zur Beurtheilung des sog. Mittellateins. After a brief examination of the causes which led to the decadence of Latin, affecting its study in the schools and its correct use by the people, the special conditions existing in Spain, France and Italy are touched upon, and an attempt is made to fix a date when Middle Latin may be said to begin. Except for Spain, this may be put about the middle of the sixth century. When we remember that before this time final *m* was silent, final *i* had sunk to *e*, final *u* to *o*; that the sharp distinction between long and short vowels was lost, and *ae* written not simply for *ē*, but for *ē*, the decay of the Latin declension cannot excite wonder. In the first declension there were properly but two cases: nom., voc., acc., abl. in *a*; gen., dat. in *e*. In the second declension the dat., acc., abl. ended in *o*, the gen. in *i*, with great irregularities in spelling. In the third declension all the oblique cases virtually ended in *e*, although for the gen. the spellings *is*, *i*, *es*, *e*, *em*, *ae* are found, and similar confusion prevailed in the other cases. The fourth declension was merged in the second, and the fifth in the third. In the nom. s. of Declension II a difference of treatment arose. In Italy, Spain and Switzerland final *s* was mostly dropped. In France it was more

often retained. The people, moreover, said *aprus*, not *aper*. In Decl. III, except in France, *es* and *e* were identical, and new nominatives were formed after the analogy of the oblique cases, as *cucumer*, *vomer*, *merces* for *merx*; *pontes* for *pons*; *antistites*, *principes*, etc. The nom. was even written *facultatem*, *principem*, the *m*, of course, being silent. In neuters we find new nominatives like *carcere*, *animale*, *sale*, *melle*, although neuters in *us* sometimes go over to the II Decl. In the plural the following endings occur:

I Decl. Nom. *e* (= *ae*); acc. *as*; dat., abl. *is*, *es*, *iz*.

II Decl. Nom. *i*, acc. *os*, more frequently written *us*; dat., abl. *is*, *es*, *aes*, *ies*.  
Neuters: nom., acc. *a*.

III Decl. Nom., acc. *es*, *is*, *ies*. With this is merged the V Decl., as the IV with the II Decl.

In the gen. pl. the III, IV and V Declensions followed the analogy of the I and II. Thus we find from *mensis*, *misoro*, *mesoro*, *mesorum*, *μησῶρον*, *mesoru* and *nisoru*. These, however, do not occur in France. A few examples are given of datives irregularly formed, as *amicibus*, *avibus*, *natibus*, *colonibus*, but the lengthy ending in *ibus* was for the most part avoided.

As a consequence of this blurring of case-endings, the feeling for proper syntax is lost. The accusative is used for the abl. absolute, as in late Latin the abl. was rarely used without a preposition. Hence *se vivum*, *impleta tempora*, *rebelles caesos*, etc. The acc. is used for the nom. In an inscription of 341 occurs (*h*)*onorem oblatum est*, pronounced *onore oblato est*.

In Italy the loss of final *s* in plural cases led also to the following results:  
1. In Declensions I and II the nom. takes the place of acc. 2. In Declension III, for distinction from the singular, the *i* of the second declension is adopted. Hence *ad omni* = *ad omnes*. In France, on the contrary, the *s* was retained. This difference may often serve to fix the locality of certain documents.

The details in regard to the neuter plural forms, and the fate in a later period of the singular forms above described, cannot here be given. In closing, the writer calls attention to new growths which accompanied the decay, especially to the use of *de* and *ad* to express case-relation. In this abstract we have necessarily omitted the numerous examples with the exact references.

Wölfflin, pp. 581-97, gives a full account of the usage of *instar* in different periods, and offers an ingenious explanation of its origin. From glosses and from the literary use, the first meaning of *instar* is shown to have reference to size, with an implication of equivalence to something else; the idea of similitude is a development from this, and not established before Vergil. *Ad instar*, which does not occur before the second century, is due to the efforts of African writers to give *instar* a legitimate construction like *ad exemplum*. Later on *iuxta* and *secundum* are made to govern *instar*. Ovid uses *pondus et instar*, Columella *instar pondi*. Wölfflin, accordingly, comparing a Swiss-German expression, "*die Stimmen stehen in (ein)*" = "*die beiden Wagschalen halten sich das Gleichgewicht*," and noticing that *στατήρ* and *statera* are used for balance, assumes that *instar* is an old inf. = *instare* with loss of final *e*, accompanied by a shortening of *ar*. One may also assume *poculum est in stare librae* = "*der Becher ist so schwer, das er die Andere mit einem Pfunde belegte Wagschale zum stehen bringt*." This removes most of the difficulties, and explains at once why *instar* was indeclinable.

Goetz, p. 597, withdraws his emendation of two passages in Apuleius, given in the previous number, p. 341, and which we characterized as venturesome, being reminded by Dr. Gunderman of ἀφάνναι, ἐν ἀφάνναις, and the gloss of Suidas, σκινδαψός : ἀφάνναι, and apinae : φάννας. The gloss he now would explain in this way :

*aefamiae* : [*apinae*  
*aestimiae* : ] *pro aestimationibus*.

He queries also whether it may not be identical with Ital. *affanno*, Diez. I, 8. The St. Gall gloss, *aefunne* we still think represents a Greek word.

Another specimen of the *thesaurus* prepared by Hauler includes the words *abdicabilis*, *abdicatio*, *abdicativus* and *abdicatrix*.

Zingerle, p. 604, points out the archaic *donicum* used by Hilarius, Prol. Psalm. 2, Mign., p. 234, 4; also *episcopium*, Hilar., Prol. Psalm. I, Mign., p. 233, 15.

The Miscellen, pp. 605-16, which are particularly interesting in this number, include short articles by Bücheler, Stowasser, Vogel, Sittl, Havet, and a list of additions and corrections to previous numbers prepared by the editor.

Pp. 617-30 are occupied by reviews.

M. W.

FLECKEISEN'S JAHRBÜCHER FÜR CLASSISCHE PHILOLOGIE. 1883.<sup>1</sup>

Fascicle 7.

66. A review of Schneidewin's Agamemnon, second edition, revised by Otto Hense; review by Wecklein. Hense is commended for abandoning that radical treatment to which he subjected his revision of Nauck's Trachiniai. H. has left Schneidewin's own work on the Agamemnon uncorrected, as far as possible, though a decided toning down of S.'s exaggerated discoveries of the height and depth of the poet's meaning is apparent. This moderation, however, has led to an unevenness and an occasional inconsistency. One must regret the strong influence which Ahrens' work (first supp. vol. Philologus) has had on Hense. A full account is presented of all those portions of this edition where the impression of inaccuracy or faulty judgment is given. The review is not favorable.

67. Zu Aischylos. Three short articles, the first by Lugebil, supplementary to Nauck, on the interchange of *πολύς* and *μέγας* in Aisch. Application of these remarks is made to the Seven against Thebes, 489, and the question is raised whether we are to read *πολλήν* or *μεγάλην*. The next is by Mähly, on the first chorus of the Hiketides; the third, by A. Hildebrandt, in reply to Lugebil (Jgbr., 1882, p. 727), on the interpretation of lines 380 and 381 in the Seven. In the ninth Yasna chapter of the Avesta, Haoma tells Zarathustra, who was the first man to press the Haoma: "Kerasaspa was a noble youth who slew the horned dragon, the devourer of horses and men, poisonous and green. Over him Kerasaspa cooked his meal at midday; then was it hot for the dragon; he issued forth and upset the boiling water." If he also howled, we get some light possibly upon the *μεσημβριναὶ κλαγγαί* of the dragon in Aischylos.

<sup>1</sup> See A. J. P. VI, p. 504; also VI, p. 234.

68. *ὅ, ὅπερ, ἄ*, in the sense of 'wherefore,' 'while,' 'although.' The article is by R. Schneider, and covers ten pages. The conclusion drawn is: The acc. of specification in pronouns, where it serves to connect with what goes before, in the sense of 'with ref. to which,' 'wherefore,' 'since indeed,' 'although,' or 'while,' begins with Homer, runs down into late Greek, in writers of prose and poetry, but is at no time common. This warns us to be careful in emending such uses of these pronouns.

69. On the hypothesis of Aristophanes' Wasps. K. Zacher, Breslau. Critical notes.

70. Zu Ciceros Briefen. Critical note on Epis. XV 4, by B. Hirschwälder, Breslau.

71. Pausanias und seine ankläger. J. Schubart, Kassel. A sharp and decidedly unfavorable review of G. Hirschfeld's article in the *Archaeol. Zeitung*, XL 97 ff., 'Pausanias und die inschriften von Olympia.' Hirschfeld may have shown quite clearly that Pausanias' list of athletes does not reach beyond the second century B. C., and may have compared all that has been found and bears upon the list of athletes with great care. But that Pausanias described not the Olympia of his time, but of 200 B. C., is a thesis, as S. firmly maintains, which Hirschfeld has not yet proved.

72. Baedeker's *Griechenland* (1883). Favorably reviewed by L. Schwabe, Tübingen.

73. Zu Ciceros Rede pro Milone. Textual criticisms by A. Uttenkamp and Rohde.

(9.) Zu Florus. Three emendations proposed by Eussner, Würzburg.

84. *Animum inducere* in old Latin. A. Funck. The meanings of this expression are reduced to two categories: First, where the meaning is 'to convince one's self'; secondly, where the meaning is 'to decide.' These two meanings, which can easily fall together, came from one origin. *Animum inducere* with *ut*, or with the infinitive, often conformed with *aliquem inducere*. Madvig, however, in discussing Livy's use of this expression, shows where it did not conform.

(49.) Wisibada. S. Widmann, Wiesbaden. A discussion of Cuno's derivation of this name (see *Jgbr.*, 1883, p. 302).

75. Horazischer Realismus. Th. Plüss, Basel. The Horatian realism touched upon here is to be found in the aging Lydia and the 25th of the first book of Odes. Sarcasm as a motive in Horace is not so common as we would have it; frequently, where it does become the motive, there is no intention to hurt or to be personal. Nay, his sarcasm may arouse some entirely opposite feeling, like pity. Horatian realism may, after all, be ideal both in purpose and in effect. The sharp and hard lines of a hard and sharp actuality are intended to reproduce an aesthetic effect on the spectator, who recognizes in the picture the clear image of what he had often felt, though perhaps obscurely. There is no crass realism in *Carm.* II 20.

76. Zum libellus de Constantino Magno. Hydenreich, Freiberg. A new edition of this work is necessary, in which many improvements in the text as we have it may find place, by collating the new manuscript C.

## Fascicle 8.

77. Prolegomena ad papyrorum graecorum novam collectionem edendam. C. Wessely, reviewed by Landwehr, Berlin. An analysis of W.'s work is given, but Landwehr confines his review to the disquisitiones palaeographicae and diplomaticae, and the interpretatio instrumenti I and II. The review is not favorable; it fails, however, to expose any positive errors in Wessely's work. The larger work, to which these prolegomena were to serve as a preface, not yet having appeared, it was impossible that the reviewer, in aught he had to say, should feel assured that he hit just those features of the treatise which deserved either censure or praise.

78. Zu Hieronymus de viris illustribus. Textual notes on three passages, by W. Gemoll, Striegau.

79. Zur geschichte des zweiten athenischen bundes. Höck, Husum. This was the federation of B. C. 378. Busolt had concluded as to its terms that, in deliberations on war, peace, and treaties with other States, the members of it had only an advisory power with reference to the Athenians. The demus might, therefore, reject a dogma of the council of the confederation for a treaty to be concluded with a foreign State, which would then have a binding force on the members of it, without even the Athenians taking the trouble to inform them. This view Höck opposed in the Jahrb., 1878, 473 ff. In the present article he argues from the formulas of the oaths as found in C. I. A. II 1; add. n. 49b. In Hermes XIV 119 ff. he argued from the terms of the peace of Philokrates, holding that the Athenians, in consultations on war, peace, and alliances, were guided by the proposals of the majority of the confederation; or if they rejected or changed them, such action was to be ratified by it before its members could be compelled to conform. Lenz now understands that the *δόγματα συμμάχων* did not have so great importance in treaties of alliance as in war and peace. Höck's present article aims to combat this and to answer Busolt.

80. Zur schlacht bei Marathon. Sohr, Wiesbaden. An explanation of Nepos's description: "Namque arbores multis locis erant raras."

81. Homerisches. C. Nauck. Note on *εἰκοσνῆριτος* and on *ἔξετε ἀδμήτην*, II. Ψ 266 and 655.

82. Zur landeskunde und geschichte Kilikiens. Neumann. 25 pages devoted, first, to the western limit of Kilikia; secondly, to the pass between Kilikia and Syria. K. Müller is our only authority on the divisions of Asia Minor. This paper would supplement his work on Kilikia by a quotation from Strabo that Artemidoros made Kilikia begin with Kelenderis; what lay west of it did not belong to Kilikia. Pomponius Mela and Plinius, however, give Anemurium as the western limit. As to the pass between Kilikia and Syria, it was what is to-day the pass in the Province So, and not the one in Demir Kapu.

83. Zu Minucius Felix. Eussner, Würzburg. In Oct. 10, 3 *non regnata* is proposed for *non regna*.

84. Zu Hesychios Milesios. Hesselmeier, Tübingen. Critical notes.



85. Ein vermeintlicher archetypus des Lucretius. Brieger, Halle. Against Woltjer's hypothesis of an original codex as common source for those now in existence (Jahrb., 1881, pp. 769-83). This hypothesis is based upon the fact that omissions, interpolations, and disarrangement of lines are not infrequently separated from one another by an interval of 13 lines, or a multiple of 13. Of this Brieger makes a critical examination, coming to the conclusion that the number of places where corruptions of the text, of any character at all, occur and can be explained on this hypothesis, is very small; and over against this number stands a still larger one of corruptions which speak directly against it. There are only 25 cases to support W.'s hypothesis—too few, according to the reviewer, to render probable the existence of this archetype, with its 26 lines to a page, 13 to a column.

86. Zu Ciceros briefwechsel mit M. Brutus. O. E. Schmidt. This comes as a protest against the rather general acceptance of Meyer's skeptical views touching some of the letters to Brutus, in his pamphlet, "Untersuchung über die Frage der Echtheit des Briefwechsels Ciceros ad Brutum." He examines Meyer's five or six specifications on the spuriousness of the third of the first book of letters; yet he comes to no convincing results that show Meyer to have failed at all.

87. Zur lateinischen anthologie. Eussner, Würzburg. A note on Seneca's *De Vita Humiliori*.

88. Zur Orestis Tragoedia. K. Rossberg. Textual criticisms on some 75 lines.

(50.) Philologische gelegenheitsschriften.

Fascicle 9.

89. Das erste jahr des peloponnesischen krieges. Ein beitrage zur chronologie des Thukydides. H. Müller-Strübing, London. This is a lengthy article, running through 35 pages of this fascicle and 55 of the following. Lack of space would seem to forbid any adequate summary of it here; the article is commended in its entirety to those interested in the subject discussed.

90. Zu Horatius. A criticism by Hultsch of Schwering's note on Epist. II 2, 43. Certainly Horace, in using *curvo* and *rectum* in this line, does not mean that we should understand, as S. does, that he took a full course in the geometry of the Academicians, and that he alludes to the beginning of such a course here.

91. Die textüberlieferung der nicomachischen ethik. Susemihl, Greifswald. A reply to Busse in Hermes XVIII, pp. 137-47.

92. Engelmann's Bibliotheca, 1882, reviewed by Klussmann. "We still have, in this 8th edition, no bibliography of classical authors which answers the demands of to-day. The unqualified praise the work receives in the Lit. Centralblatt, 1883, No. 12, is greatly to be regretted."

93. Ein chorlied der Soph. Elektra. Plüss, Basel. A study of the question whether this choral song (vv. 472 ff.), wherein the curse resting over the house of the Pelopidae is the theme, is any disturbance to the "tendenz" of the

tragedy. Plüss takes the ground that it is not, but rather essentially in line with it.

94. Pausanias und sein verteidiger. G. Treu. A reply to Schubart's article in the preceding number. "The conclusion is inevitable that both Pausanias and Plinius drew their material from the same literary traditions, which were accessible at least by the middle of the second century B. C." As to the Polemon hypothesis, Treu is inclined to adopt it, as explaining the compiling of the events at Olympia in a literary form; and he may have been the author whom both Pausanias and Plinius followed.

95. Zu Aristophanes Fröschen. Drescher, Mainz. A critical note on v. 1124, in which λέγεις is proposed for λέγε.

96. Zu Valerius Maximus. H. Wensky, Breslau. Critical notes on 8 passages.

97. Zu Tacitus Agricola. E. Bährens, Groningen. Four critical notes.

98. Zu Martiales. W. Gilbert, Dresden. Critical notes supplementary to Gilbert's Ad Martialem quæst. criticae. , Dresden, 1883.

99. Zu Tacitus Annalen. Konrad Zacher, Breslau.

100. Differentiae sermonum. S. Widmann, Wiesbaden. Hagen's Anecdota Helvetica (1870), pp. 275-90, give the *differentiae sermonum* which this article considers. Widmann has found portions of the same on the inside of the covers of an old book. These are given in this article, together with some observations on the differences between their readings and those of Hagen's.

101. Zum Itinerarium Alexandri. H. Rönsch. Critical observations on a dozen passages.

102. Zu den Scriptores historiae Augustae. Critical notes on Severus Imp. II 3; Alexander Severus IX 4; Probus IV 2, by J. Golisch, Schweidnitz.

Fascicles 10 and 11.

103. Zu Xenophon's Anabasis. R. Bünger. Four pages of critical notes on III 4, 19-23.

104. Beiträge zur Erklärung homerischer Personennamen. F. Weck. Review by K. Schirmer. The ending -κλῆς is not connected with κλέος; it is the same with -culus in Latin; e. g. in *Paterculus*. The ending -ιππος is for -πετο, seen in the endings of the Latin words *utpote*, *ipse* (= *ispte*). -πολεμος is a superlative ending, so that Δημοπτόλεμος = *crassissimus*, according to W. -μαχος has nothing to do with μάχη, but -μα- is a suffix used to form adjectives or proper names, and -χο- is a diminutive ending, so that Τηλέμαχος is diminutive to Τήλεμος. -μενος is not connected with μένος, but is the same as in the Latin *Picumnus*, *Vertumnus*, etc. The review is favorable.

105. Homerisches. K. Frey. Three pages on (1) the story of the Odyssey and the Nibelungenlied, (2) the Nymph-Grotto in Ithake, (3) Minor Characters of the Iliad. Philaimenes.

106. Zur Kritik des Aischylos. H. Stadtmüller. Critical notes on The Persians and The Seven against Thebes.

(5.) Zu Euripides. H. Gloël. Critical notes on Elektra 545 f.; Ion 483, 1288; Troades 961, 1167-72; Phoinissai 983.

107. Zu Ciceros Cato Major. J. Ley. Notes on §4, 11 and §20, 75.
108. Vermischte bemerkungen. F. Rühl. A continuation of what appeared in 1878, pp. 309-20, in Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher.
109. Zu Athenaios. K. Ohlert. Fourteen pages of textual notes.
- (40.) Zur erklärang und kritik der homerischen gedichte. A. Gemoll. An interpretation and explanation of the word *μεσόδμη*. He translates it *querbalken*.
110. Pausanias und Olympia. G. Hirschfeld. A reply to Schubart in Heft 7. "I still consider Pausanias as a compiler; people who give closer definitions might call him a plagiarist."
111. Zu Tiberianus. K. Rossberg. Critical notes on II 24.
112. A critical note on Vergil's Aeneid. By L. Mejer.
113. Die consonanten-gemination im Lateinischen. E. Baehrens. An article of some 20 pages, in two chapters; the first devoted to a consideration of the doubling of consonants before the time of Ennius; the second, to the condition in which the language was left and the tendency given to its orthography through the influence of his work. Baehrens throws overboard the theory that the assimilation of consonants in the middle of a word was a process carried on in the oldest Latin. Whole hosts of words were formed by dropping out single consonants or entire syllables. Quantity was an entirely unsettled thing at the time of Ennius, and it was one of his great contributions that, in finding it necessary for the purposes of his verse that vowels should have a settled quantity, he did so much toward fixing them. His process was exceedingly arbitrary, and often, of two quantities for the same vowel in the same word, he chose that which was not the correct one, but existed among careless speakers only, and suited his purpose. Thus *cēlla* is from *cēlo*, but careful speakers pronounced the derivative *cēla*. The second chapter traces the doubling of consonants down from the time of Ennius through the Ciceronian period.
- (50.) Philologische gelegenheitsschriften.
- Fascicle 12.
114. Zu Sophokles Philoktetes. M. Schmidt. Critical notes advocating a recasting of lines 50-100. Lines 70-78, 66-69, 91-92 are held to be spurious.
115. Zur oekonomie der historien des Timaios. H. Kothe. A brief consideration of the evidence at hand to show the divisions of the history of Timaios, and a word in conclusion on the value of his history, drawn mainly from Polybios.
116. Zu den quellen der Messeniaka des Pausanias. G. Busolt. The framework of the history of the first Messenian war is taken from Thukydides and Xenophon; to fill it out, all kinds of details were resorted to, including even miracles and fables. Doubtless Pausanias's immediate authority put such details as these together from stories heard from the Messenians themselves.
- (67.) Zu Aischylos. A. Lowiński. A note on Agamemnon, l. 518.
103. Zu Xenophons Anabasis. F. Reuss. Notes (1) on I 10, 9 f.; (2) on *λόχοι ὁρθοί*, which he considers equivalent to "reihen-colonnen"; (3) on III

4, 19-23. "Reckoning three feet for a man, each side of the square was 360 feet. The sides of the hollow space inside were 216 feet (=46,656 sq. ft.)—enough space for the light-armed and the baggage."

117. Zum fünften buche der Aristotelischen Politik. H. Flach. Some 18 or 19 critical notes.

(40.) Zur erklärungs und kritik der homerischen gedichte. A. Gemoll. Zur neunzahl.

(60.) Zu Dionysos von Halikarnassos. Some dozen critical notes by Carl Jacoby.

(78.) Zu Hieronymus de viris illustribus. A critical note on Chap. 59, p. 41 (Harding), by Terwelp.

(45.) Zu Ovidius Fasti. Critical note, by H. Gilbert, on III 497 ff.

118. Horazische allegorie. Th. Plüss. Whether the ode *O navis referent* be an allegory or not.

119. Zu Tibullus. E. Baehrens. A critical note on the first of the two Tibullian Priapea, p. 85 (Baehrens). Read *dux pecoris scaenae causa erat hircus avis*.

120. Die zeit der Lex Cornelia de Permutatione provinciarum (44 B. C.). O. E. Schmidt. "The law was adopted on the 27th or 28th of July."

121. Zu Ammianus Marcellinus. F. Vogel. On *densare* and *densere*.

122. Zu Gennadius de viris illustribus. Seven critical notes by W. Gemoll.  
W. E. WATERS.

#### MNEMOSYNE, Vol. XIII, Part 2.

J. J. Cornelissen contributes, pp. 115-34, Notes on Fronto, using Naber's Teubner edition. Two or three specimens will show the character of the whole. Ep. 49 (64), p. 90: Id ut quam primum eveniat et dolor plantae quiescant (*sic*), di iuvent. "*Iuvare-ut* dubito num usquam praeter h. l. legatur. Legendum existimo *di diunt*, quod a Frontone, veterum scriptorum sedulo imitatore, certe haud absonum est." Ep. 57 (72), p. 92: Desisse febriculam colligo ex litteris tuis. Nunc, mi magister, quod ad fauces attinet, brevi temperantia *appelletur*, et mihi at plenior nuntius veniet. "Haereo in *appelletur*, quod sine dubio corruptum. Nomen aliquod excidisse videtur, ita ut fere legendum sit *brevi temperantia (morbus) depelletur* . . . vel avelletur . . . sequentia emendavit Schopenus scribendo *et mihi a te lenior nuntius veniet*, quod probo, nisi quod pro *lenior* malim *laetior*." Ep. 59 (74), p. 93: Sed re vera illa res maxime mihi animum a studiis depulit, quod, dum nimium litteras amo, tibi incommodus apud Porcium fui, ut res ostendit. "Adscripsit Maius: 'Codex: *portum*, sed videtur emendatum *Porcium*.' Veram lectionem *portum* iudico. Per portum enim Aurelius Centumcellas intelligit. Ad villam ab Hadriano ibi aedificatam quam tum habitabat, Frontonem suum invitarat, qui, ex tepido cubiculo ad mare progressus, haud leviter perfrixerat." "Proba et genuina forma nominis proprii, quod legitur, pp. 111 et 137, *Demonstratus* est, non *Demonstratus*. Littera *n* prave insertum saepius talia monstra verborum peperisse exempla docent, quae affert Corssen. . . . Onensimus, Atlans, Dymans,

praestantissimus cett. Ipse Fronto habet, p. 235 : manlui ; pp. 17, 30, 88, et 132 desiderantissimus passive, p. 212, epigrammantis."

The next article, pp. 135-75, is filled by Herwerden with a continuation of his notes on Herodotus. The following may be taken as specimens. VII 37 : καὶ εἰρετο τοὺς μάγους τὸ θέλει προφαίνειν. "Praeferenda videtur librorum A, B, C, scriptura θέλοι, quia post verba rogandi noster, paucis locis exceptis de quorum sanitate dubito, usurpavit optativum in quaestione indirecta, sive pronomine interrogativo utitur sive articulus eius vice fungitur." VII 54 : τῇ δὲ ὑστεραίᾳ ἀνέμενον τὸν ἥλιον [ἐθέλοντες] ἰδέσθαι ἀνίσχοντα. "Quicumque de suo adscriptis ἐθέλοντες non intellexerat veterem structuram verborum expectandi ab Homero inde usitatam. Supra V 35, 2, ἀνέμεινε ἀναφῖναι τὰς τρίχας . . . Thuc. IV 134, οὐκ ἀνέμεινεν ἡμέραν γενέσθαι," etc. VII 163 : ταύτην μὲν τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμέλησε, ὁ δὲ ἄλλης εἶχετο. "Barbaram huius loci structuram, in quo ne verbi quidem notio apta est, emendavi Ionis Euripidei editione, pag. 34, pro glossemate substituens genuinam vocem μετῆκε, collatis glossis Hesychii μεθι- μούνη · ἀμέλεια. μεθίμων · ἀμελής. μεθῆς · ἀμελήσης." IX 2 : κατὰ μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἰσχυρὸν Ἑλλήνας ὁμοφρονέοντας . . . χαλεπὰ εἶναι περιγίνεσθαι καὶ ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποισι. "Verbum περιγίνεσθαι, cum iungi nequeat cum Accusativo Ἑλλήνας ὁμοφρονέοντας, aut depravatum est ex παρίστασθαι, aut ante id sumenda es lacuna. Possis χαλεπὰ εἶναι (νικᾶν τε καὶ) περιγίνεσθαι. Cf. infra 27, περιεγεγόμεθα καὶ (malim τε καὶ) ἐνίκησαμεν ἔθνεα ἐξ (τε dele) καὶ τεσσεράκοντα." IX 23 : οὕτω δὲ οὐκ ἐτί οἱ ἱππῶται ὑπέμενον . . . ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἐκείνῳ ἄλλους προσαπώλεσαν [τῶν ἱππέων]. "Stipes sit oportet, qui monendus sit equites amisisse ex suo numero equites, non pedites. Talia editores tolerare." Herwerden takes occasion in this article to criticise unfavorably several of Naber's recent suggestions, particularly his interpretation of the story of Melissa's ghost, in V 92, referred to in this Journal (Vol. VI, p. 520). He says: "Lenissimae sane mutationes, sed, ut mihi quidem persuasum est, non tantum non necessariae sed plane perversae. 'Inaudita querela est (inquit) quam tum demum intelligere possemus, si Melissa omni veste detracta in rogum imposita fuisset.' Sed enim ex ipso usu verbi συγκαταθάπτειν iam apparet non crematas fuisse Melissaes vestes, itaque falsam esse coniecturam συγκατακαυθέντων et veram codicum scripturam οὐ κατακαυθέντων. Si igitur vestes combustae non fuerunt, probabile est pervetusto more . . . ne Melissaes quidem corpus concrematum fuisse sed integro corpore humatum. Sic facile intelligitur queri Melissaes umbram, quae statim defunctae corpus reliquisset, nullum sibi usum esse vestimentorum, quippe quae cum corpore suo humi condita in sepulcro manerent, nec combusta animam suam in inferos descendentem comitari non potuissent. Fieri potest ut vetusta fabella ostendat nobis argumentationem eorum qui antiquissimum illum et rariorem sepeliendi morem improbarent. Utut est, combustis deinde iussu Periandri matronarum Corinthiarum quas ei detraxerat vestibus non nuda mansit, ut Nabero videtur, Melissaes umbra, sed etiam calidior facta est et ornatior quam se fore speraverat, meliusque sic eius ira placari potuit quam condendis aureis ornamentis in fossa, ut Naberus adscita sua coniectura κατεκλήμε sequentia interpretatur. Praeterea κόσμον τὸν κάλλιστον non aurea ornamenta sed pulcherrimas vestes significare manifesto docet praegressum verbum ἀπέδυνε, ut taceam ex sensu quo Naberus voluit aptius esse κατέκρυπτε quam κατεκλήμε, nam in fossa aliquid κατακρύπτομεν, in arca κατακλύμεν. Tandem argutari mihi

videtur vir ingeniosus scribens, vestes in fossam collatas ne cremari quidem posse, dum fumus omnia obtineat et aer introcludatur. Quod ita verum foret, si aut cremationem fossa superne clausa fuisset, sed in patenti fossa satis larga et non nimis profunda, praesertim addita materie vim flammae alenti, contra esse apparet." "Non intellexisse mihi videtur amicus scurrilis sane et plus Aegyptiaci quam Attici salis habentis ioci rationem, qualem lascivorum puerorum more permisit sibi Amasis, qui Patarbemi, quem Apries iusserat ζῶντα Ἀμασιν ἀγαγεῖν παρ' ἑωυτόν, secum ire iubenti ἀπεματᾷσε, καὶ τοῦτό μιν ἐκέλευε Ἀπρίῃ ἀπάγειν. Nempe Patarbemi dicenti ἐκέλευσέ με βασιλεὺς παρ' ἑαυτὸν ἀγαγεῖν σε Amasis ἀποπαρδὼν respondit: ἀντ' ἐμοῦ ἀγαγε τοῦτο. Nam corrigendum videtur aut ἀγαγεῖν pro ἀπάγειν, aut utrobique ἀγειν, ut priori loco exhibet recentior sed eadem melior codicum familia. Contra rescripto cum Nabero ἀπαγγέλλειν perit omnis dicterii aculeus."

We have next, pp. 176-87, notes by C. M. Francken on Tibullus. He says: "Me nunc invitat ad Tibulli lectionem EDUARDUS HILLER, recenti editione (apud B. Tauchnitz, 1885), quae . . . tutum se ducem praebet si quis purum a recentiorum coniecturis et figmentis cognoscere poetam cupiat. Prudenti iudicio ductus in editione, quae annotationem in margine non admittebat, ordinem versuum in codicibus traditum intactum servavit editor; nam nec Ribbeckii in una, nec Baehrensii in pluribus elegiis permutationes, ut taceam iam de iis, quae Lachmanno aetate antecesserant, tanto assensu exceptae sunt, ut de iis apud doctos fere constet." He has most to say about Eleg. I 8, in regard to the want of coherence of its parts; and he thinks that the editors might have done more by the aid of the types to indicate the places at which there appears to be a rupture of continuity. "Ex offensione multorum interpretum efficitur satis certo ubi aliquid laxati sit: convenit plerumque de locis, ubi filum abruptum: hoc certe poterat notari." The remedy may be very doubtful; but "aliquid est διάγνωσιν facere, etiamsi θεραπείαν adhibere non possis. . . . Sed de hoc quidquid videbitur, illud nemo negabit iniuriam nullam fieri poetae et emolumentum parari legenti, si editor, ubi defectum cohaerentiae animadvertat, eius defectus indicium aliquod det. Similiter el. 4 post v. 14 lacunam notarem, si mihi Tibullus esset edendus. Complectitur subinde una elegia in codicibus duo aut tria carmina aut fragmenta, quae ad eandem rem pertinent et propterea iuxta posita iniuria in unum conflata sunt, ut factum videtur II 3."

Then follows, pp. 188-221, the first instalment of *Disquisitiones de Pronominum Personalium formis Homericis*, by J. Van Leeuwen, Sr. He begins by showing that the elision of *iota* in the dat. sing. is not infrequent in Homer (e. g. ἀσπίδ' ἐνὶ κρατερῇ, Γ 349). "Facile tamen intelligitur, posteros hanc elisionem, quae durior ipsis videretur et a vitae quotidianae usu abhorreret, nonnisi invitos in antiqua poesi perpersos fuisse, et sicubi eam evitare possent evitare; sive aliter verba collocando, sive voculam aliquam inserendo, sive contrahendo quae elidenda erant, sive ad violentius etiam remedium confugiendo, quale est illud quod proponitur in Schol. ad P 324: κήρυκ' Ἡπυτίδῃ διὰ μέτρον συσταλτέον τὸ ρν, ut κήρῡκι scilicet recitaretur potius quam κήρῡκ'." The elision of *oi* was naturally still more objected to; "maluerunt interdum veteribus poetis vocabula obtrudere inaudita, quam admitterent elisiones quales posterior aetas evitabat." There are, notwithstanding, at least ten verses in which such an

elision must be assumed in *μοι, σοι, τοι, e. g. Z 165*: *ὅς μ' ἔθελεν φιλότῃ μιγήμεναι οὐκ ἐβελύσῃ*. A trace of this is probably to be found in Attic in such places in the dramatists as Ar. Vesp. 776, *τοντί μ' ἀρέσκει*. Where the pronoun is written in full it is *μοι*, not *με* (as in Vesp. 828, *τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἀρέσκει μοι*), except in Ran. 103, *σὲ δὲ ταῦτ' ἀρέσκει*, which is probably corrupt. If the pronoun of the third person suffered the same elision, then "evanescente litera aeolica prorsus oblitterabatur. Uno tamen et altero loco exitium effugit. Sic O 105 cum apud omnes fere, metro invito, legatur *ἐνθ' ἔσαν (F)οι πέπλοι*, in codice Marciano verus verborum ordo servatus est, *ἐνθα οἱ ἔσαν πέπλοι*, id est *ἐνθα F' ἔσαν πέπλοι*." Other similar indications are adduced; and the assumption of the possible elision of this *οι* is used to correct various errors, *e. g. K 285*, *σπεῖό μοι, ὥς δτε πατρὶ ἄμ' ἔσπεο Τυδείδι δίω*. "At non hoc dixit, neque ita *πλατειάσδοντι* dea aurem prae buisset; sed dederat poeta: *ἐσπέό μ' ὥς*, etc. Apud Homerum enim aoristus *ἐσπόμην*, natus ex *σεσεπόμην*, reduplicationem suam servat per omnes modos; legitimae igitur apud eum sunt formae *ἐσπέσθαι, ἔσπεο, ἐσπόμενος*, nec dubium est quin Aristarchus, cui merito editores Larocheus et Christius obsequuntur, vere indicaverit (Schol. K 246): *ἀνάγκη πάσα . . . δασύνειν καὶ τὴν μετοχὴν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ε ἄρχεσθαι*." "Iam exhibebo vocabulum quod medium est intercisum. Antiqua est vox *ἐπιτάρροθος*, quae in deorum lingua idem significat quod posterioris aevi mortales vocabulo *βοηθός* indicare solent. . . . In originem vero Olympici huius vocabuli inquirere mihi quidem nefas videtur: nesciverunt veteres grammatici, nescire video hodiernos, et in perpetuum opinor nescient. Illi tamen malebant de etymo nugari quam ignorantiam profiteri. Quid igitur designaverint videre est in Etymologico Magno: *ἐπιτάρροθος* [*βοηθός* ἰσχυρός, σύμμαχος. παρὰ τὸ ῥόθος (ῥοθῶ τὸ παρορμῶ) γίγνεται ἐπίρροθος· καὶ πλεονασμῷ τῆς τὰρ συλλαβῆς ἐπιτάρροθος, ὃ ἐν τῷ βοηθεῖν πρόθυμος καὶ παρορμῶν. . . . A voce igitur *ῥόθος* derivaverunt et literas *τὰρ* abundare scilicet censebant. Quae vero abundant, sine detrimento possunt abici: abiciantur ergo sicubi metrum hac medela sublevari possit! Abiecerunt homines, quos inane veriloquii studium a sana ratione deduxerat, et dum versuum numeros restituere sibi videntur, vocem antiquam misere mutilaverunt. Poeta enim cum Δ 390 dixisset: *τοίη F' ἐπιτάρροθος ἦεν Ἀθήνη* et Ψ 770: *κλῖθι θεά, ἀγαθή μ' ἐπιτάρροθος ἐλθὲ ποδοῖν*, illi ut elisio vitaretur, delicatis ipsorum auriculis parum grata, scripserunt *οἱ ἐπίρροθος* et *μοι ἐπίρροθος*, et usque ad nostra tempora illud monstrum propagatum est. Si quis hanc explicationem audaciorē ratus credere mihi recuset, auctor ei sum ut cum versu supra citato Δ 390 conferat locum parallelum E 808, et ipsi Sapientiae deae credit, iisdem ibi verbis sed paulo aliter dispositis idem narranti: *τοίη Φοι ἐγὼν ἐπιτάρροθος ἦα*." In a note he discusses and illustrates the usage and meaning of the real word *ἐπίρροθος*, which "adjectivum (non substantivum) . . . significabat idem quod *ἐπίψογος, contumeliosus*, et . . . a locis gemellis Homericis . . . prorsus est alienum." Space does not permit a further abstract of this article, which is exceedingly well written and worth reading, even if one cannot in all points agree with the author's conclusions.

J. Van der Vliet, pp. 222-7, gives some notes on the Apologia of Apuleius; and on p. 228 J. J. Hartman offers three conjectural emendations of the Antigone of Sophocles.

C. D. MORRIS.